

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.,
 Plaintiff,

vs.

PULSE ELECTRONICS, INC., *et al.*,
 Defendants.

2:07-CV-00331-PMP-PAL

ORDER

On November 14, 2012, after Plaintiff Halo Electronics had completed presentation of its case in chief before the jury, Defendant Pulse Electronics, Inc. filed Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law of Non-Infringement, No Induced Infringement, and No Willfulness (Docs. #444 and #445). Pulse Supplemented its Motion (Doc. #455) on November 18, 2012. On November 19, 2012, Plaintiff Halo filed a written Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Rule 50(a) (Doc. #458).

On November 20, 2012, Plaintiff Halo Electronics, Inc. also filed a Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Rule 50(a) and Rule 52(c) (Doc. #461). Defendant Pulse filed a Response to Plaintiff Halo's Motion (Doc. #499) on December 4, 2012.

On November 26, 2012, the jury returned verdicts in favor of Plaintiff Halo and against Defendant Pulse on most of the infringement claims asserted, and

1 also found Defendant Pulse's infringement to be willful and awarded monetary
2 damages.

3 The Court finds the evidence adduced at trial clearly supports the verdicts
4 returned by the jury and therefore concludes that Defendant Pulse's Motions for
5 Judgment as a Matter of Law (Doc. #444, #445, #455), must be denied.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff Halo's Counter Motion for
8 Judgment as a Matter of Law (Doc. #461) is DENIED as moot in view of the
9 verdicts of the jury.

10 DATED: March 11, 2013.

11 

12

PHILIP M. PRO
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26